

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

**2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT  
FOR:**

**To the Bell and Beyond**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	<i>Non Compliance</i>
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<b>Instruction is clear</b>	2.5 <i>Between Approaching and Meeting Standards</i>	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Academic Program</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	2.5 <i>Between Approaching and Meeting Standards</i>	<b>Financial viability</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standard</i>		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 5-1:1</b>	3 <i>Meets Standards</i>		

*As of the 2008-2009 school year, To the Bell and Beyond will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.*

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** To the Bell & Beyond  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 31, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>BOTH</b> of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Tutor evaluations ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Recruiting policy for tutors ( <u>one copy</u> ) -Sample tutor contract ( <u>one copy</u> )	-Resumes -Sample tutor contract -Training agendas -PowerPoint presentations	<b>X</b>		-One of the tutor qualifications listed in the Tutor Contract does not match the tutor qualifications approved in the provider's application amendment; -Two tutors do not meet provider's tutor qualifications; -Although some professional development trainings were provided to tutors, not all of the training sessions described in the application were offered to tutors. In addition, the provider had documentation tutors completed only one of the trainings offered.
Recruiting materials	<b>TWO</b> of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Recruitment flyer -Incentive policy		<b>X</b>	-Recruitment flyer is appropriate and in line with provider's application; -Incentive policy is appropriate.
Academic Program	<b>ONE</b> of the following: Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Lesson plans -Connection to Indiana Academic Standards	<b>X</b>		-The lesson plan submitted for one group observed is in line with the provider's application. As described in the application, read-out-loud activities were incorporated into this observed lesson. However, lessons for two other groups observed were not in line with the provider's application. For instance, although the application states that students will be engaged in educational math games and interactive math activities, students were only observed working on math worksheet packets. In addition, one group of students was only observed to be completing homework (and engaging in non-academic activities...see "Onsite Monitoring" section) although the lesson plan and session description stated students would work on a language arts lesson and that homework would not be completed during instruction time;  -Lesson plans clearly connect to Indiana Academic Standards.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent</p>	<p>-Progress reports -Progress report timeline -SES Contract -SES Agreements</p>	<b>X</b>		<p>-Although progress reports were submitted to the district timely, the provider did not submit progress reports to parents timely;</p> <p>-Although progress reports share student goals and student strengths/areas in need of improvement, they do not provide specific information regarding how students are improving in their academic achievement. The reports share whether the student’s progression is “very significant, significant, or not significant” but no specific information explaining how this rating was earned or how the student is improving is provided. In addition, not all progress reports include assessment scores. All of these items are required components for progress reports as per the memo sent to providers in December 2007;</p> <p>-Some progress reports list goals upon which students are working that are not listed as targeted areas on students’ learning plans or SES Agreements;</p> <p>-There is a lack of consistency in the session descriptions included with progress reports. Some descriptions are lists of items covered during sessions, some are detailed narratives of the work completed during sessions, and still others are one or two word statements;</p> <p>-Some progress reports describe students spending an entire tutoring session on homework which is not in line with provider’s application which states that tutoring “is not a study hall or home work session but an interactive academic instruction...”.</p>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <p>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider’s pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</p>	<p>-Explanation of learning plan development process -Explanation and evidence regarding assessments’ correlation to Indiana Academic Standards -Pre-test scores and Individual Learning Plans</p>	<b>X</b>		<p>-Learning plan development appropriately involves the use of pre-test scores to identify students’ skill gaps and develop individualized learning plans for students. Learning plans include standards upon which students will work, pre-test results and program goals for each student. However, learning plans do not include a description of the services, lessons, and/or instructional strategies that will be used to assist the student in accomplishing objectives;</p> <p>-Although both assessments appear to be appropriate, one assessment was not a part of the provider’s original approved application;</p> <p>-Explanation of assessments’ connections to Indiana Academic Standards provides a clear description of the pre and post-test correlation to standards.</p>

On-site Monitoring Rubric  
OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** To the Bell & Beyond  
**SITE:** Fairview Elementary School  
**TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** 4 Tutors in Rms. 101, 102, & 202  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 3

**DATE:** March 18, 2008  
**REVIEWER:** S.T. & C.E.  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 4:00 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>-Tutors worked in three different rooms with small groups of students. In one room, a tutor worked one-on-one with a student on number recognition, identifying shapes and comparing object sizes while another tutor worked with a small group of students. The students working in a small group appeared to be working on homework worksheets but it was unclear what other activities students were supposed to work on as the group was very disorganized (see below). In a second room, a small group of students took turns reading parts of a play out loud and when they were finished the tutor asked each student reading comprehension questions. In the last room, a small group of students worked independently on math worksheets. The tutor periodically checked student progress and provided clarification when needed.</p> <p>-Some of the observed lessons were in line with the description in the provider’s application. For example, students were grouped by grade levels as described in the application. In addition, in one room, a tutor was observed using a read-aloud activity to develop students’ reading and language arts skills as described in the application. However, some lessons did not match the description in the application. For instance, contrary to what was stated in the application (tutoring “is not a study hall or home work session but an interactive academic instruction...” ) and what was stated in the provider’s tutoring session description (students work on homework for 15 minutes from 3:30-3:45 and receive academic instruction from 3:45-4:45), students in one group worked on homework, played in the play area of the room or played with whiteboards (see “Time on Task” section) during the observation that began at 4:00. Also, the application stated that tutors would reinforce math concepts in a “small group interactive way” and additionally referred to Everyday Math game technology tools. However, the students were not observed using any Everyday Math game technology tools and were not involved in any interactive activities as they worked independently at a table on math worksheet packets during the observation.</p>

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Instruction is clear		2.5			<p>-Three of the four tutors made their expectations (in terms of what students should be accomplishing) clear to students. In addition, these tutors appeared to have a plan in place in terms of structuring what students would do during the tutoring session. Also, these tutors appropriately provided clarification and follow-up instruction to students when necessary;</p> <p>-Students in one group, however, did not appear to have a clear understanding of the lesson objectives that would be covered or clearly understand their tutor’s behavior expectations. Students who finished their homework were unclear what they should do next to students which led to confusion and off task behavior (see “Time on Task” section). It is not clear whether students lacked clarity because the tutor did not articulate the objectives and expectations or if it was because this information was communicated to students but not in a manner that they understood.</p>
Time on task is appropriate		2.5			<p>-The students working with three of the four tutors were on task during most of the session. For the most part, students completed their lessons with little disruption. When students became distracted, tutors successfully redirected them;</p> <p>-Most of the students working with the tutor on homework were off task for part or all of the observation. Some students socialized with each other when they were finished with their homework. Other students played in the designated play area of the room (it was a room for younger students) while still other students played with whiteboards (writing on them or drawing on them with no direction or instruction). The tutor spent most of his/her time trying to get students to complete assignments or “do something quiet”. However, this tutor’s attempts to redirect were not typically successful.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			<p>-Three tutors demonstrated an appropriate knowledge of material being presented and implemented appropriate tutoring strategies to assist students;</p> <p>-The tutor working with students on homework did not appear to have a plan regarding what students would do once their homework was complete (if there was a plan, this was not clear during the observation). This tutor was not observed providing students with direct instruction, using tutoring strategies to provide academic support to students, or using classroom management skills to promote time on task;</p> <p>-In addition, it was unclear whether all tutors were familiar with provider’s lesson format as described in the application, since only one tutor (the tutor that utilized the read-aloud method for language arts instruction) was observed implementing the type of instruction and lessons that were described in the application.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 5-1:1			X		<p>-Student/instructor ratio matched ratio range (small or large group instruction) reported in the original provider application;</p> <p>-Small group instruction was observed as stated in provider’s application.</p>

# **On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric** **COMPLIANCE Components**

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** To the Bell & Beyond  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** March 31, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following:  -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks (At least one tutor’s background check was not completed prior to the tutor working with students)		<b>X</b>
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i><b>In addition to:</b></i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Emergency procedures -Student release policy	<b>X</b>	
Financial viability	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage  <i><b>In addition to:</b></i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Verification of Liability Insurance -Tax returns for last two years -Accountant’s report on financial statements	<b>X</b>	